DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 184 SP 039 923

AUTHOR Chambers, Sharon M.; Henson, Robin K.; Sienty, Sarah F.
TITLE Personality Types and Teaching Efficacy as Predictors of Classroom Control Orientation in Beginning Teachers.
PUB DATE 2001-02-00
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (24th, New Orleans, LA, February 1-3, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Alternative Teacher Certification; *Beginning Teachers; *Classroom Techniques; Elementary Secondary Education; *Personality Traits; *Self Efficacy; Student Behavior; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Emergency Teacher Certification

ABSTRACT

This study explored the personality types of beginning emergency permit teachers to determine whether those pursuing alternative certification displayed patterns in personality type. It also investigated the predictive relationship between personality types and teachers' beliefs concerning control in classroom management. Participants were 120 teachers pursuing teacher certification through an emergency permit teacher education program at a mid-sized Texas university. Participants were administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (which measured personality type, the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory, and a revised version of the Teacher Efficacy Scale). Results indicated that the teachers were somewhat dispersed in personality types, but they tended to emphasize the sensing and thinking dimensions. Regression analyses suggested that personal teaching efficacy was a stronger predictor of instructional classroom management than personality type. However, personality type was a stronger predictor than efficacy of people management beliefs. Results indicated a slight tendency for the emergency certification teachers to be interventionist in their classroom control orientations. (Contains 51 references.) (Author/SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 184

Running head: PERSONALITY TYPES

Personality Types and Teaching Efficacy as Predictors of Classroom Control Orientation in Beginning Teachers

Sharon M. Chambers

Texas A&M University – Commerce

Robin K. Henson

University of North Texas

Sarah F. Sienty

Texas A&M University – Commerce

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S.M. CHAMBERS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, February 1-3, 2001, New Orleans. Correspondence to the first author should be sent to Sharon_Chambers@tamu-commerce.edu. Correspondence to the second author should be sent to rhenson@tac.coe.unt.edu. Correspondence to the third author should be sent to Sarah_Sienty@tamu-commerce.edu.

SP039923

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was twofold. First, the personality types of beginning emergency permit teachers was explored to determine if those pursuing alternative certification displayed patterns in personality type. Second, because classroom management issues are central to the professional lives of teachers, the predictive relationship between personality types and the teachers' beliefs concerning control in classroom management was investigated. Participants included 120 teachers pursuing teacher certification through an emergency permit teacher education program at a mid-sized university in Texas. Participants were administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Form G), the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory and a revised version of the Teacher Efficacy Scale. The teachers were somewhat dispersed in personality types but tended to emphasize the Sensing and Thinking dimensions. Regression analyses suggested that personal teaching efficacy was a stronger predictor of instructional classroom management beliefs than personality type. However, personality type was a stronger predictor than efficacy of people management beliefs. Results indicated a slight tendency for the emergency certification teachers to be interventionist in their classroom control orientations.

Personality Types and Teaching Efficacy as Predictors of Classroom Control Orientation in Beginning Teachers

After the publication of A Nation at Risk (1983), a top priority on state and national educational agendas has been higher academic standards for teacher education candidates. However, research indicates that effective teachers possess numerous characteristics that influence teaching performance and student learning. These characteristics are not all in the cognitive domain, but include traits such as personality attributes, self-esteem, teaching commitment, and gender. For example, personality traits found to be important aspects of effective teaching that are non-academic in nature include assertiveness, willingness to take risks, independence, self-confidence, creative, warm and loving (Baldwin, 1990).

Numerous researchers have shown that there is a relationship between personality types and classroom management and student learning outcomes (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1982; Bush, 1985; Byrd, Cobel, & Adler, 1982; Krutz & Kremor, 1982). Some research has emphasized that the personality characteristics of the teacher is the most significant variable in classroom success (Getzels & Jackson, 1963). For example, Jackson and Pauly (1999) found that individual teacher personality traits affect how teachers communicate to their students. They found that teachers with certain personality traits were more capable of shifting to accommodate each of their students' various needs and that this ability may be the most important factor in determining the success or failure of students in the classroom.

Teachers report that classroom management is one of the most difficult problems in education. An individual teacher's personality traits can affect their beliefs regarding discipline and classroom management (Martin, Yin, Baldwin, 1997). Bush and Achilles (1986) found that humanistic-authoritarianism personality characteristics are closely related to attitudes toward

discipline. Their research indicated that humanistic methods of classroom management and discipline were more successful than authoritarian ones whose style of classroom control is a more harsh and ineffective approach. They found that when control was only suppressive and not corrective, it does not have educational value, and as a result, "violates principles of democracy, and has negative long-range effects both for the classroom learning environment and for the student personally"(13). Based on a framework developed by Wolfgang and Glickman (1980, 1986) there are three approaches to classroom interaction—non-interventionist, interventionist, and interactionalist. Non-interventionist classroom management is the least directive and controlling, and they believe the child has intrinsic motivation and needs to be expressive. On the other hand, the interventionist is most controlling, and emphasizes more behavior modification practices. Mid-way between these two extremes is the interactionalist who strives to resolve issues that are satisfactory to both teacher and students.

Because of the shortage of teachers in the nations' public schools, more individuals are being hired to teach through emergency permit programs or other alternative certification processes. Although research provides insights into the importance of understanding personality traits of individuals choosing to become teachers, few studies have examined the personality traits of teachers certified through an alternative certification program. There are various classroom management strategies that have been developed and are known to be effective models taught in teacher education programs to preservice, inservice and alternative certification teachers (Emmer, 1986). However, in order to prepare more appropriately for the professional development education of alternative certification teachers, early identification of personality types may be important. It may be possible to change the style of classroom management in teachers who use more harsh approaches, such as the interventionist, and therefore help them

become more effective in developing a positive classroom learning climate that affects students' personal lives and learning.

Teacher self-efficacy has also been found to be an important variable in teachers' classroom management approaches. Teacher efficacy is related to personality in that it is an internally held belief. However, teacher efficacy is conceptually distinct from measures of personality because it refers to a specific self-referent belief in a teacher's ability to organize and execute the actions necessary to reach certain attainments. This perspective is context specific as opposed to generalized personality traits (Pajares, 1996). More specifically, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (in press) defined teacher efficacy as a teacher's "judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated." Teacher efficacy has emerged as a worthy variable in educational research. As Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) noted, "Researchers have found few consistent relationships between characteristics of teachers and the behavior or learning of students. Teachers' sense of efficacy . . . is an exception to this general rule" (p. 81). The idea that teacher's self-beliefs are determinants of teaching behavior is a simple, yet powerful idea.

The correlates of teacher efficacy are many. Students of efficacious teachers have outperformed students of other teachers on a variety of achievement tests (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1998; Moore & Esselman, 1992; Ross, 1992). Watson (1991) observed greater achievement in rural, urban, majority Black, and majority White schools for students of efficacious teachers. Regarding classroom management behaviors, efficacious teachers persist with struggling students and criticize less after incorrect student answers (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). They are also more likely to agree that a low SES student should be placed in a regular education setting and less likely to refer students for special education (Meijer & Foster, 1998;

Podell & Soodak, 1993; Soodak & Podell, 1993). Teachers with high efficacy tend to experiment with methods of instruction, seek improved teaching methods, and experiment with instructional materials (Allinder, 1994; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988).

Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) examined the relationship between preservice teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs of pupil control. Using the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) and the Pupil Control Ideology form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967), they reported that

> prospective teachers with high teaching efficacy are more humanistic in their pupil control ideology than those with low teaching efficacy; however, the relationship exists only among prospective teachers who believe that they have the ability to make a difference in student achievement – that is, only among those who also have high personal efficacy. (p. 88)

It is possible, then, that preservice teachers who are confident in their capabilities display more humanistic, and less interventionist, classroom management strategies.

Purpose and Research Questions

Because of the potential role of personality types and efficacy beliefs in teacher's attitudes toward control in classroom management, the purpose of the present study was twofold. First, the personality types of beginning emergency permit teachers was explored to determine if those pursuing alternative certification displayed patterns in personality type. Second, because classroom management issues are central to the professional lives of teachers, the predictive relationship between personality types and teachers' beliefs concerning control in classroom management was investigated. Based on prior research (Emmer, 1986; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990), we also examined teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of classroom control orientation.

Accordingly, the following research questions guided the present study: a) What are the personality types of university based emergency certification teachers and how do these compare to teachers from other forms of alternative certification? b) What personality characteristics are predictive of interventionist classroom management beliefs? c) How is teacher self-efficacy related to classroom management beliefs?

Method

Participants and Procedures

Participants included 120 teachers pursuing teacher certification through an emergency permit teacher education program at a mid-sized university in Texas. Participants had already attained at least a Bachelors degree, were in their first year of teaching, and were pursuing teacher certification while on the job. Employers viewed these teachers in the same light as any other certified educator with similar experience in terms of job responsibilities, workload, and salaries. However, emergency permit teachers were assigned a public school mentor teacher, must complete a certification program within three years that includes university course work, and received regular visits from university supervisors. The emergency permit teachers in the program represented rural, suburban, and urban schools.

During the spring and fall university semesters, 2000, 120 emergency permit teachers enrolled in university education and reading courses were invited to participate in the study. These teachers served under emergency permit contracts for grades 7-12 in the northeast Texas area. Three questionnaires were administered during regularly scheduled class times. Demographic data was obtained from personal reports included in the questionnaire.

The teachers' age indicated the non-typical nature of the participants as compared to traditional preservice teachers. Only 34.2% indicated their age to be 20-25. Older age groups

were well represented (26-30 - 19.2%, 31-35 - 7.5%, 36-40 - 10%, 41-45 - 12.5%, 46-50 – 7.5%, 51-55 – 4.2%, 56+ - 5.0%). Just under one-half of the participants were above 30 years of age. The majority taught in high school (56.7%) or middle school (32.5%) with smaller numbers teaching elementary school (4.2%) or across levels (5.9%). However, the teachers predominantly expressed their preferred choice of certification as secondary level (80.8%) with much fewer desiring grades 4 – 8 (12.5%), K – 4 (4.2%), or multiple (2.4%) certifications. Participant ethnicity was 76.7% White, 18.3% African-American, and 5.0% Hispanic.

Instrumentation

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI, Form G (1993) was used as a measure of personality type. The MBTI is a widely used personality inventory with positive evidence of construct validity for its scores (Thompson & Borrello, 1994). MBTI scores represent four theoretically based psychological types grounded in Jung's (1971/1921) personality theory, each of which is a function of bipolar personality characteristics. Use of the MBTI as a measure of personality in a variety of settings has been widespread (cf. McCaulley, 1981). In the present study, four scale scores were created by subtracting one of the bipolar dimensions from the other, yielding continuous scores representing which bipolar dimension is predominantly held and to what degree. These scores were used to both classify each person on all four personality types (in a 4 X 4 matrix) and to characterize the strength of the personality type in substantive analyses. As an example, one participant received an Extraversion score of 23 and an Introversion score of 4. The Extraversion v. Introversion scale score was 19 (23-4), representing a strong tendency toward Extraversion (Introversion tendencies would be represented by negative scores and strength by absolute value of the score). The four personality type scales include Extraversion v. Introversion, Sensing v. Intuition, Thinking v. Feeling, and Judging v. Perceiving.

Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory (ABCC). We used the ABCC (Martin, Yin, & Baldwin, 1998) to assess classroom control orientation. The ABCC includes 26 items with a 4-point Likert scale and proposes to measure three orthogonal dimensions of classroom management control: instructional, people, and behavioral management. Each scale was derived to assess a continuum of control (cf. Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980; Wolfgang, 1995) ranging from interventionist to interactionalist to non-interventionist, with interventionists expressing the greatest need/desire to control and manipulate the classroom environment. According to Martin et al. (1998, p. 7), the instructional management scale (14 items) "includes aspects such as monitoring seatwork, structuring daily routines, and allocating materials;" the people management scale (8 items) "pertains to what teachers believe about students as persons and what teachers do to develop the teacher-student relationship;" and the behavioral management scale (4 items) "includes setting rules, establishing a reward structure, and providing opportunities for student input." Although Martin et al. argued for a three factor orthogonal solution, the people and behavioral management factors had a moderate interfactor correlation (r = .484) in their study and some items appear to share similar characteristics. Henson and Roberts (2001) also provided evidence of unity between these factors in a confirmatory factor analysis of the ABCC with preservice teachers. Therefore, factor analysis was conducted in the present study to examine the possibility of a two factor solution (see below). Several items were reverse scored so that high scores on each scale are representative of a stronger interventionist perspective.

Hoy and Woolfolk's (1993) revised Teacher Efficacy Scale. We used Hoy and Woolfolk's 10-item shortened version of the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES; Gibson & Dembo, 1984), which originally had 16 items. The teachers responded to a 6-point Likert scale anchored

at "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree." The revised TES purports to measure two orthogonal dimensions: general teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy. However, recent research has suggested that the general teaching efficacy really assesses something of an external versus internal locus of control orientation, rather than outcome expectancy, which was the original intent of the scale (Coladarci & Fink, 1995; Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Henson, Bennett, Sienty, & Chambers, 2000; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Therefore only the 5-item personal teaching scale was used as a measure of a teacher's reported confidence in his or her ability to positively impact student learning. The unweighted mean of these items were used as scale scores in subsequent analyses.

Data Analysis

Because factorial structure is a function of obtained scores and not the instrument per se (cf. Henson & Roberts, in press; Thompson & Daniel, 1996), classroom management and efficacy scores were submitted to factor analysis to determine if the expected structure was recoverable in the present data. Exploratory rather than confirmatory procedures were used due to the marginal sample size for confirmatory analyses (Kieffer, 1999). Descriptive statistics were used to evaluate the personality types of the emergency certification teachers. Hierarchal regression was used to examine the predictive effect of personality and self-efficacy on classroom management beliefs.

Results

Factor and Reliability Analyses

ABCC. The ABCC was submitted to an exploratory factor analysis to evaluate whether the anticipated score structure would be evidenced in the present data. The interitem correlation matrix was submitted to principal components analysis. There were nine eigenvalues greater than

one but the scree plot suggested two factors. Neither of these factor retention rules upheld the expected three factor structure. Because the eigenvalue greater than one rule almost always overestimates the number of factors and the scree plot tends to be more accurate (Zwick & Velicer, 1986), two factors were retained and rotated to the oblimin (delta = 0) criterion. The interfactor correlation was near zero (r = .03), so an orthogonal solution (varimax) was used (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). The two factors corresponded to the instructional and people management factors and explained 25.20% of the correlation matrix variance. The expected third factor, behavioral management, was problematic and did not possess strong internal structure. The low coefficient alpha for scores on this scale (α = .12) also pointed to this dynamic.

Using a .35 criterion, most items had factor pattern/structure coefficients for the expected instructional and people management factors. One exception included an item with a low pattern/structure coefficient on instructional management. Three of the four behavioral management items had substantial coefficients on the people management factor, indicating that these factors may actually assess the same construct. This finding is consistent with Henson and Roberts' (2001) confirmatory factor analysis of the ABCC, which also suggested unity between these factors. Factor scores for the instructional and people management factors were created via the regression method for use in subsequent analyses. Coefficient alphas for instructional and people management (including the three items from behavioral management) scores were .73 and .68, respectively. Descriptive statistics for the observed variables for instructional and people management are reported in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Personal teaching efficacy. The interitem correlation matrix for the five personal teaching efficacy items from Hoy and Woolfolk's (1993) revised version of the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984) were also submitted to principal components analysis. The general teaching efficacy items were not used in the analysis due to construct validity problems with scores from this scale (cf. Coladarci & Fink, 1995; Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Henson, Bennett, Sienty, & Chambers, 2000; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Two eigenvalues greater than one were observed but the scree plot indicated a clear one factor solution. One personal teaching efficacy factor was extracted that explained 45.3% of the correlation matrix variance. All items had pattern/structure coefficients of at least .35. Personal teaching efficacy factor scores were created via the regression method for use in subsequent analyses. Coefficient alpha for personal teaching efficacy scores was .68. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for observed personal teaching efficacy scores.

MBTI. Factor analysis of MBTI scores was not conducted because only the summed dimension scores were available rather than item scores. However, MBTI scores have historically yielded strong factor structures (cf. Thompson & Borrello, 1986) and there was no reason to expect differently in the present sample, although it is understood that factor structures can differ between samples (Henson, 2000). Descriptive statistics for the observed scale scores are reported in Table 1.

Personality Types

The teachers were somewhat dispersed in personality types as illustrated in Table 2. Regarding categorized scale scores, there were more Extraverts (55.8%), Sensing types (55.8%), Thinking types (54.2%), and slightly more Perceiving types (50.8%). These frequencies compare

favorably to those observed by Meisgeier and Richardson (1996) in a study of 91 alternative certification teachers pursuing an alternative regional service center program in the same state. One clear exception regards the Judging v. Perceiving continuum, which was evenly split in the present sample but was weighted toward Judging types (68.13%) in the Meisgeier and Richardson sample.

All 16 crossed MBTI personality types were represented but three cells accounted for at least 10% of the entire sample. There were 19 (15.8%) ISTJ types, 16 (13.3%) ENFP types, and 12 (10.0%) ESTJ types. Again, these results are similar to the Meisgeier and Richardson (1996) sample, in which ISTJ (14.29%) and ESTJ (13.19%) were among the top three most frequent types. Interestingly, the ISTJ and ESTJ cells in both samples represent similar personality types that vary only on the Extraversion v. Introversion continuum.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Predicting Classroom Management Beliefs

Hierarchal regression analyses were conducted to examine first the predictive effect of personality on classroom management beliefs and second the impact of adding personal teaching efficacy to the models. MBTI scale scores were used as predictors in the first block because personality is often considered an innate trait. Furthermore, prior research (Meisgeier & Richardson, 1996) and the present results (see Table 2) indicate that alternative certification teachers tend to be at least moderately dispersed as regards personality types, despite some research suggesting that effective teachers tend to have more focused personality profiles (cf. Lessen & Frankiewicz, 1992). Beyond personality, the effect of personal teaching efficacy was examined in the second block due to the predictive relationship between teacher efficacy and

other positive teacher outcomes (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Factor scores were used for both dependent variables, instructional and people management, and personal teaching efficacy.

Table 3 presents results from the hierarchal prediction of instructional management beliefs. Personality types did not make a practical or statistical prediction of instructional management beliefs. However, adding personal teaching efficacy to the model yielded a statistically significant F ratio change ($p = .039$) and an overall R^2 effect of 6.4%. Examination of the beta weights and structure coefficients supports the interpretation that self-efficacy was the primary contributor to this effect, accounting for 69.2% (r_s^2) of the latent predicted variable. Sensing v. Intuition made a secondary contribution of 24.2% (r_s^2). Table 4 presents results from the hierarchal regression for the people management dependent variable. Unlike instructional management, the personality block made the largest contribution to the prediction of people management with an R^2 of 6.0% in the first model. Personal teaching efficacy added essentially nothing to the effect. Full model structure coefficients indicated that Thinking v. Feeling was the dominant personality predictor ($r_s^2 = 84.1\%$) with a secondary negative relationship by Extraversion v. Introversion ($r_s^2 = 25.7\%$).

INSERT TABLES 3 – 4 ABOUT HERE

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to characterize the personality types of emergency permit teachers participating in a university certification program and examine the relationship between personality and self-efficacy with classroom management beliefs. The personality types of the teachers were dispersed across all 16 MBTI classifications. However, the teachers tended toward Extraversion, Sensing, and Thinking in the scale scores. These findings mirror those of Meisgeier and Richardson's (1996) study of alternative certification teachers going through an educational

service center program. One exception included no preference for Judging over Perceiving in the present study.

Interestingly, two of the most frequently endorsed personality types in both studies, ISTJ and ESTJ, differed only on the Extraversion v. Introversion continuum. Ignoring the E v. I continuum, 25.8% of the teachers could be characterized as STJ. These personality types tend to emphasize the Sensing and Thinking dimensions of personality. For example, according to the Myers-Briggs test booklet, the ISTJ characteristics include: "Serious, quiet, earn success by concentration and thoroughness. Practical, orderly, matter-of-fact, logical, realistic, and dependable. . . ." They also are "well organized" and "Make up their own minds as to what should be accomplished. . . ." Furthermore, the ESTJ person is characterized as: "Practical, realistic, matter-of-fact, with a natural head for business or mechanics." These people like to "organize and run activities." The dominant traits for these persons include a serious, realistic perspective and an organized demeanor.

Meisgeier and Richardson (1996) hypothesized that these personality types "may account for the assignment of many [alternative certification teachers in their study] to settings demanding structure and strict management, notable in classrooms for students with behavior disorders" (p. 356). Indeed, extrapolating these types to the classroom setting, one would expect the teachers to establish a goal-focused and disciplined classroom.

Because the teachers were pursuing their certification as a second career after having already attained at least a Bachelors degree in a field, the goal orientation of the sample might be expected. In addition, some emergency permit teachers taught in schools where classroom control is difficult, but expected. It then becomes a self-perceived necessity to maintain strict structure and control. Emergency permit teachers are often given teaching assignments with multiple course

preparations and are asked to teach courses outside of their degree major for which they have little preparation.

Because of the nature of the emergency permit teacher's situation, the teacher education program is field-based. Curricula are aimed at needs of beginning teachers and professional development content is integrated with these teachers' classroom experiences. To what extent the emergency permit teachers continued the use of the professional practices learned is unknown. In particular, it is unclear how these teachers integrated classroom management strategies into their practice and to what degree they relied on interpersonal strategies they have used in the past. Based on observations of and discussions with the teachers, it appeared that many have field-based problems in the forefront of their thinking. This focus likely impact classroom management beliefs and strategies.

The regression analyses showed small, and different, predictive effects for instructional and people classroom management beliefs. Instructional management beliefs were predicted primarily by self-efficacy and secondarily by Sensing v. Intuition, both with positive relationships to the dependent variable. As the teachers expressed greater confidence in their ability to positively impact student learning, they expressed a tendency for interventionist beliefs regarding instructional activities. These results are in contrast with Woolfolk and Hoy's (1993) findings related to pupil control ideology in preservice teachers. However, because the current teachers were actually working as teachers, rather than hypothesizing about teaching, the realities of teaching may have been more salient to the present participants.

Furthermore, the realistic and practical Sensing perspective corresponded to interventionist beliefs. The instructional interventionist tendency is consistent with this personality type and likely would manifest with teachers "monitoring seatwork, structuring daily routines, and allocating

materials. . ." as well as having shifted instructional "focus of lesson planning from activities designed to encourage learning to those likely to discourage disruption" (Martin et al., 1998, p. 7).

The people management variable was positively related to Thinking and negatively related to Extraversion. Again, the logical, firm, and tough-mindedness of Thinking types is consistent with higher interventionist scores concerning the teacher-student relationship. Interestingly, the person-centered Extraverts were less interventionist, a finding that supports the validity of scores on both the E v. I and people management constructs.

One ramification of the present results points to the tendency for a need/desire for control in the classroom by the alternative certification teachers. The current teachers were, on average, more interventionist than the secondary teachers reported by Martin et al. (1998) in their presentation of the ABCC (instructional management, $M = 2.98$; people management, $M = 2.22$, $n = 196$). The personality findings support this interpretation. Teacher education programs educating alternative certification teachers may consider directly tailoring instruction to foster less interventionist perspectives on classroom management, assuming that interventionism interferes with fluid instruction and learning. While most programs, including the present one, do emphasize constructivist approaches, it is sometimes questionable whether these methods are adopted by students and, more specifically and stemming from the present findings, whether alternative certification teachers are less prone to adopt constructivist perspectives.

Classroom management is one of the chief concerns for preservice and inservice teachers (cf. Woolfolk, 1998), and simultaneously, one of the topics receiving the least attention in many teacher education programs. One possible explanation for the interventionist perspective in the current sample may center on the fact that the teachers are working with full teaching responsibility while still pursuing final certification. Therefore, the teachers are directly confronted with classroom

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

management and discipline issues on a daily basis. Without other options, the teachers may resort to more control oriented means for classroom management. While this pursuit of teaching while actually teaching is a function of the emergency certification nature of the sample, methods courses could combat this tendency toward control by making students aware of their personality traits that may lend themselves toward an interventionist management style, and integrating management skills into instruction. As Martin et al. (1998) suggested, proactive concepts "such as smoothness and momentum of instruction" can be useful in prevention of disruption and off-task behavior (cf. Kounin, 1970).

Future research efforts should consider potential change in classroom management beliefs of emergency certification teachers from beginning of their program into their regular years of teaching. It is unclear whether the interventionist perspective may solidify or weaken with time. Researchers could also examine the impact of integrated classroom management instruction in teacher education methods course, thereby testing one of the recommendations noted above. Finally, given the consistent relationship between teacher efficacy and myriad student and teaching outcomes (cf. Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998), the relationship between efficacy and classroom management beliefs merits further investigation. For example, to what extent is efficacy mediated by teaching behaviors leading to positive student outcomes? What are these behaviors and how are they related to classroom management principles?

In sum, the present investigation observed a tendency toward logical, realistic, organized, and matter-of-fact personality types in the emergency certification teachers. Furthermore, these personality types were slightly related to interventionist classroom management perspectives. The current sample also reported a stronger sense of control than the secondary teachers in the normative sample of the ABCC (Martin et al., 1998).

References

Allinder, R. M. (1994). The relationships between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. Teacher Education and Special Education, 17, 86-95.

Anderson, R., Greene, M., & Loewen, P. (1988). Relationships among teachers' and students' thinking skills, sense of efficacy, and student achievement. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34(2), 148-165.

Baldwin, B. & Others. (1991, November). Personality factors of elementary and secondary pre-service teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Brophy, J. E. & Rohrkemper, M. (1982). Motivational Factors in Teachers' Handling of Problem Students. (Research Series No. 115). East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

Bush, D. (1985, March/April). Relationships among teacher personality, pupil control attitudes, and pupil control behavior. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago

Bush, D. W. & Achilles, C. M. (1986). Predicting effective disciplinary styles of teachers. Catalyst for Change, 15(3), 10-13.

Byrd, J. W. & Coble, C., & Adler, C. (1982). A study of personality characteristics of science teachers. School Science and Mathematics, 82, 321-331.

Coladarci, T., & Fink, D. R. (1995, April). Correlations among measures of teacher efficacy: Are they measuring the same thing? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Emmer, E. (1986, December). Effects of Teacher Training in Disciplinary Approaches. Final draft of report submitted to the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.

Getzels, J. & Jackson, P. (1963). The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching, 506-582. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569-582.

Glickman, C. D., & Tamashiro, R. T. (1980). Clarifying teachers' beliefs about discipline. Educational Leadership, 37, 459-464.

Guskey, T. R. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4, 63-69.

Guskey, T. R., & Passaro, P. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. American Educational Research Journal, 31, 627-643.

Henson, R. K. (2000, November). Sacrificing reliability and exalting sampling error at the altar of parsimony: Some cautions concerning short form test development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Bowling Green, KY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. forthcoming)

Henson, R. K., Bennett, D. T., Sienty, S. F., & Chambers, S. M. (2000, April). The relationship between means-end task analysis and context specific and global self-efficacy in emergency certification teachers: Exploring a new model of teacher efficacy. Paper presented at

the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. forthcoming)

Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2001, February). A confirmatory factor analysis of preservice teachers' responses to the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. forthcoming)

Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (in press). Exploratory factor analysis reporting practices in published research. In B. Thompson (Ed.), Advances in social science methodology (Vol. 6). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Hoy, W. K. & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. The Elementary School Journal, 93, 356-372.

Jackson, M. & Pauly, J. (1999, Nov./Dec.). Funsters and feelers: Students thrive with teaching that suits their natures. Momentum, 30(4), 37-40.

Jung, C. G. (1971). Psychological types. In R. F. C. Hull (Ed.), The collected works of C. G. Jung (Vol. 6). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Originally published in 1921).

Kieffer, K. M. (1999). An introductory primer on the appropriate use of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. Research in the Schools, 6, 75-92.

Kounin, J. S. (1970). Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kurtz, C. & Kremer, L. (1982). Personality characteristics and teaching behavior. Education, 102(4), 359-365.

Lessen, E., & Frankiewicz, L. E. (1992). Personal attributes and characteristics of effective special education teachers: Considerations for teacher educators. Teacher Education and Special Education, 15, 124-132.

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., Baldwin, B. (1997, March). Beliefs regarding classroom management style: Differences between male & female, urban & rural secondary level teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. , Ill, March, 1997.

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., Baldwin, B. (1998). Construct validation of the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control Inventory. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 33(2), 6-15.

McCaulley, M. H. (1981). Jung's theory of psychological types and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. In P. McReynolds (Ed.), Advances in personality assessment (Vol. 5). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meijer, C., & Foster, S. (1988). The effect of teacher self-efficacy on referral chance. Journal of Special Education, 22, 378-385.

Meisgeier, C. H., & Richardson, R. C. (1996). Personality types of interns in alternative teacher certification programs. The Educational Forum, 60, 350-360.

Moore, W., & Esselman, M. (1992, April). Teacher efficacy, power, school climate and achievement: A desegregating district's experience. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Myers, I. & Briggs, K. (1993). Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Form G. Consulting Psychologist Press: Palo Alto, CA.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. Review of Educational Research, 66, 543-578.

Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Podell, D., & Soodak, L. (1993). Teacher efficacy and bias in special education referrals. Journal of Educational Research, 86, 247-253.

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effect of coaching on student achievement. Canadian Journal of Education, 17(1), 51-65.

Soodak, L., & Podell, D. (1993). Teacher efficacy and student problems as factors in special education referral. Journal of Special Education, 27, 66-81.

Stein, M. K., & Wang, M. C. (1988). Teacher development and school improvement: The process of teacher change. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4, 171-187.

Thompson, B., & Borrello, G. M. (1986). Construct validity of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46, 745-752.

Thompson, B., & Daniel, L. G. (1996). Factor analytic evidence for the construct validity of scores: A historical overview and some guidelines. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 56, 197-208.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (in press). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. Teaching and Teacher Education.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review of Educational Research, 68, 202-248.

United States. National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk : the imperative for educational reform: a report to the nation and the Secretary of Education.: The Commission: [Supt. of Docs.,U.S. G.P.O. distributor], Washington, D.C.

Watson, S. (1991). A study of the effects of teacher efficacy on academic achievement of third-grade students in selected elementary schools in South Carolina. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Carolina State College, Orangebury. (University Microfilms No. UMI 9230552)

Willower, D. J., Eidell, T. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1967). The school and pupil control ideology. (Penn State Studies Monograph No. 24). University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Wolfgang, C.H., & Glickman, C.D. (1980). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wolfgang, C.H., & Glickman, C.D. (1985). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wolfgang, C. H. (1995). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Woolfolk, A. E. (1998). Educational psychology (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82, 81-91.

Zwick, W. R., & Velicer, W. F. (1986). Factors influencing five rules for determining the number of components to retain. Psychological Bulletin, 99, 432-442.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics

Variable	M	SD	Scale/Range
Instructional Management	3.11	.37	4 point
People Management	2.87	.43	4 point
Personal Teaching Efficacy	4.90	.80	7 point
Extraversion v Introversion	2.48	13.07	54
Sensing v Intuition	2.73	14.95	57
Thinking v Feeling	2.45	12.59	51
Judging v Perceiving	.60	15.73	58

Note. MBTI scale scores were created by subtracting the second personality dimension score from the first dimension score. Thus, a scale score of 0 would represent no tendency toward a dimension, positive scores would represent tendency toward the first dimension, and negative scores would represent tendency toward the second dimension.

Table 2

MBTI Personality Types of Emergency Certification Teachers.

	Sensing Types (S)		Intuitive Types (N)	
	n = 67 % = 55.8		n = 53 % = 44.2	
	ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
	n = 19	n = 5	n = 3	n = 2
Introverts (I)	% = 15.8	% = 4.2	% = 2.5	% = 1.7
n = 53 % = 44.2	ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
	n = 7	n = 5	n = 7	n = 5
	% = 5.8	% = 4.2	% = 5.8	% = 4.2
	ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
	n = 5	n = 7	n = 16	n = 9
Extraverts (E)	% = 4.2	% = 5.8	% = 13.3	% = 7.5
n = 67 % = 55.8	ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ
	n = 12	n = 7	n = 5	n = 6
	% = 10.0	% = 5.8	% = 4.2	% = 5.0
	Thinking Types (T)		Feeling Types (F)	
	n = 65 % = 54.2		n = 55 % = 45.8	
	Judging Types (J)		Perceiving Types (P)	
	n = 59 % = 49.2		n = 61 % = 50.8	

Table 3

Hierarchal Regression Results for Instructional Management.

Predictor	R	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF	Δp	beta	r_s
Model 1	.169	.028	.028	.841	.502		
E v. I						.115	.357
S v. N						.140	.740
T v. F						.040	.212
J v. P						.031	.504
Model 2	.253	.064	.036	4.350	.039		
E v. I						.063	.237
S v. N						.116	.492
T v. F						.039	.141
J v. P						.038	.336
PTE						.196	.832

Note. r_s = structure coefficient, representing the correlation between the observed predictor scores and the latent predicted scores; E v. I = Extraversion v. Introversion; S v. N = Sensing v. Intuition; T v. F = Thinking v. Feeling; J v. P = Judging v. Perceiving; PTE = personal teaching efficacy.

Table 4

Hierarchal Regression Results for People Management.

Predictor	R	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF	Δp	beta	r_s
Model 1	.245	.060	.060	1.841	.123		
E v. I						-.066	-.507
S v. N						.048	.393
T v. F						.204	.918
J v. P						.016	.350
Model 2	.246	.060	.000	.022	.883		
E v. I						-.062	-.507
S v. N						.050	.392
T v. F						.204	.917
J v. P						.016	.350
PTE						-.014	-.151

Note. r_s = structure coefficient, representing the correlation between the observed predictor scores and the latent predicted scores; E v. I = Extraversion v. Introversion; S v. N = Sensing v. Intuition; T v. F = Thinking v. Feeling; J v. P = Judging v. Perceiving; PTE = personal teaching efficacy.